

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by Obradovich (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030156208) (hereinafter “Obradovich”).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Claims 1, 4, 13, 17 and 21 have been amended to improve the form of the claims.

Accordingly, claims 1-21 remain pending for consideration.

**Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Applicants have amended claim 1 in accordance with the Examiner’s comments at page 2, section 2 of the Office Action. At the bottom of section 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner notes “see other claims too.” In response, Applicants have also made amendments to claims 4, 13, 17 and 21. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims, as amended, fully comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph be withdrawn.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

The Office Action states at page 3, section 1 that “[c]laims 1-3” stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable by Obradovich. However, at section 6 of page 1 (Form PTOL-326), the Office Action states that “[c]laims 1-21” are rejected. Accordingly, the Office Action is not clear in this regard. Nevertheless, Applicants will address the patentability of all of

claims 1-21 in the following discussion. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action asserts that the newly-applied Obradovich reference discloses all of the features of independent claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that Obradovich discloses a system to provide maps and location tagged data in response to requests from a personal communication device (PCD) with electromagnetic communication capability having a global positioning system (GPS) and a display.

The portable information terminal combination described in the instant application's independent claim 1 includes "an image signal receiving part for receiving an image signal from one of a plurality of image pickup parts respectively installed in a plurality of facility sites, identified by an interior image information providing site and sent via a mobile communication network." The Examiner asserts that these features are fully disclosed in paragraphs 0131, 0133, and 0142-0145 of Obradovich. This interpretation of Obradovich is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph 0131 of Obradovich describes the structure of a condition reporting device (CRD) having parts shown in the block diagram of Fig. 34. In particular, the processor 1200 of the CRD transmits data from various sensors through the radio transceiver 1210.

Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph 0133 of Obradovich describes that the CRD includes a computer memory to store at least a single digitized video picture provided through a digital camera coupled to the CRD through one of its auxiliary input ports. It is also described that the CRD may obtain the single digitized picture via a direct transmission to the

CRD through the antenna, and that photographs obtained by others, such as television news helicopters, may transmit a digital picture to the CRD.

Applicants respectfully submit that paragraph 0141 of Obradovich describes that a central computer maintains a data base of the locations of CRDs and also stores an indication of the road or highway along which the CRD is located.

Applicants respectfully submit that paragraphs 0142-0145 of Obradovich describe a process for utilizing the route information stored in a PCD (Personal Communication Device) shown in Fig. 37. In step 1240, a request for CRD locations is transmitted by the PCD to the central computer system. In step 1242, the central computer system receives the locations of CRDs along the route. In step 1246, the central computer system transmits CRD locations along the route to a PCD. In step 1248, the PCD receives the locations of reporting devices. In step 1250, the PCD correlates the CRD locations to the route information and forms a map display indicating the trail plot and the CRD locations, the process then returns.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that, as briefly recited above, the Office Action's cited paragraphs of Obradovich mainly pertain to the structure and functions of a disclosed CRD (Condition Reporting Device), and also to the transmission of CRD locations to a PCD (Personal Communication Device) through a central computer system.

As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action's cited paragraphs 0131, 0133, and 0142-0145 of Obradovich are not particularly related to the image signal receiving part features described in independent claim 1 of the instant application as an element of the described portable information terminal combination.

Even further, with respect to the position detecting signal outputting part features recited in the combination of independent claim 1, the Examiner cited the same paragraphs 0131, 0133, and 0142-0145 of Obradovich. This interpretation of Obradovich is respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

As described in paragraph 0142 of Obradovich, included with the request for CRD locations is data indicating the route information maintained by the PCD (personal communication device). Applicants respectfully submit that this is clearly different from the position detection signal outputting part, of independent claim 1, which outputs a position detecting signal representing an own position of the portable information terminal.

Furthermore, with respect to the feature of transmitting the image signal to the portable information terminal, described in the last paragraph of claim 1, the Examiner again cited the same paragraphs 0131, 0133, and 0142-0145 of Obradovich.

In view of the foregoing points, Applicants respectfully consider that the disclosure of Obradovich relied upon by the Examiner is not particularly relevant to the subject matter described in independent claim 1 of the instant application. In particular, the paragraphs of Obradovich cited by the Office Action describe the transmission of the CRD locations along the route to a PCD, in a manner that does not teach, or even suggest, the features described in independent claim 1, as set forth in the foregoing discussion.

Similar arguments apply with regard to independent claims 4, 13, and 17, which are thus considered by Applicants to be allowable for reasons such as those set forth above with regard to independent claim 1. In addition, claims 2-3, 5-12, 14-16, 18-20 dependent on the independent claims 1, 13 and 17 respectively are also considered to be allowable over Obradovich.

Applicants now turn to independent claim 21 of the instant application, which is directed to an interior image information providing site combination. In rejecting independent claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Examiner cited the same paragraphs 0131, 0133, and 0142-0145 of Obradovich. Applicants respectfully submit that features of independent claim 21 are not particularly disclosed in the paragraphs cited by the Examiner for similar reasons as set forth in the foregoing discussion with regard to the other independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Obradovich does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 4, 13, 17 and 21. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, 4, 13 or 17, and the reasons set forth above.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of all outstanding objections and rejection, and request the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

**EXCEPT** for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**

Dated: September 6, 2005

By:

  
Paul A. Fournier  
Reg. No. 41,023

**Customer No. 55694**  
**DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP**  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100  
Washington, DC 20005-1209  
Tel.: (202) 842-8800  
Fax: (202) 842-8465